

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a response to the Office Action of April 23, 2007, in which a three-month term was set for response. This response is filed concurrently with a request for a one-month extension of time along with the required fees. Accordingly, this response is timely filed.

Amendments to the Specification

In this response, paragraphs 17, 26 and 71 of the specification have been amended to correct inadvertent grammatical errors.

Claim Amendments

In this response, claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12-14, 15, 17 and 18 have been amended. Claims 4, 5 and 16 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 20-24 have been added. The Applicant includes fees for one additional independent claim and one dependent claim over the limit of twenty claims.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to better recite certain claimed features. Support for these claim amendments is in paragraphs 43 and 56-59 and in claim 6 of the application as originally filed.

Claims 3, 15 and 17 have been amended to correct an inadvertent error. The word "includes" has been replaced by the word "comprises". Claim 17 has also been amended to remove certain features since these features have now been included in claim 14.

Claim 6 has been amended to better recite certain claimed features and to properly refer to antecedents. Support for the amendments in claim 6 are in paragraphs 56-59 of the application as originally filed.

Claim 8 has been amended to refer to an antecedent.

Claim 9 has been amended to provide further detail on the recited formula. Support for this claim amendment is in paragraph 37 of the application as originally filed.

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 1 since claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. Claim 11 has also been amended to recite a "power supply means" rather than a "power supply block" and to recite the structure for the power supply means which was previously recited in claim 5.

Claims 12 and 13 have been amended to properly refer to antecedents.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite the effect of the clipper adjustment signal. Support for this claim amendment is in paragraphs 56-59 of the application as originally filed.

New system claim 20 has been added which is analogous to method claim 18.

New claim 21 recites a wireless communications device that comprises the power management system claimed in claim 1. Support for this claim is in paragraphs 24 and 56 of the application as originally filed.

New claims 22 to 24 are method claims that generally correspond to system claims 1, and 11 to 13.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 6, 9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

With regards to claim 6, the Examiner argued that the recitation of "the power control signal" in lines 11-12 lacks an antecedent basis.

In response, the Applicant has amended these lines in claim 6 to recite "the second power control signal" which is introduced in claim 1 from which claim 6 depends.

With regards to claim 9, the Examiner argued that the recitation of this claim is vague since it is unclear what the corresponding formula is in order to implement at least one of the look-up tables.

In response, the Applicant has amended claim 9 to recite that the formula is based on a relationship between the various inputs to the power supply level adjustment generator and the altered version of the power level adjustment signal.

With regards to claim 11, the Examiner argued that the recitation of the terms "the power supply block" in line 1 and "the wireless device radio signals" in line 3 lack an antecedent basis.

In response, the Applicant has amended claim 11 to recite a "power supply means". Claim 11 has also been amended by removing the word "the" to simply recite "wireless device radio signals".

With regards to claim 12, the Examiner argued that the recitation of the term "the power supply block" in line 1 lacks an antecedent basis.

In response, the Applicant has amended claim 12 to recite "the power supply means" which was introduced in claim 11 from which claim 12 depends.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 10, 14-16 and 19 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ichikawa (US 2002/0013157). However, the Examiner had indicated that

the subject matter recited in claims 6, 9 and 11-13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has also indicated that claims 8, 17 and 18 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


In response, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 14 to include subject matter recited in claim 17. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 14 are allowable over the cited references. Furthermore, for at least the reason that claims 2, 3, 6-13 and 20-21 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and since claims 15 and 17-19 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 14, the Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also allowable.

In addition, since new claims 22-24 correspond to claims 11-13 which the Examiner found allowable, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22-24 are also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has any further concerns regarding the language of the claims or the applicability of the cited references, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at 416-957-1603.

Respectfully submitted,
CHAN ET AL.

By 

Tony R. Orsi
Reg. No. 55,831
Tel: 416-957-1603